



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/828,453	04/20/2004	Raymond R. Gosselin	58032US0010	3998
32692	7590	03/02/2007	EXAMINER	
3M INNOVATIVE PROPERTIES COMPANY PO BOX 33427 ST. PAUL, MN 55133-3427			NORDMEYER, PATRICIA L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1772	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/02/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 03/02/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

LegalUSDocketing@mmm.com
LegalDocketing@mmm.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/828,453	GOSSELIN, RAYMOND R.	
Examiner	Art Unit		
Patricia L. Nordmeyer	1772		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 February 2007.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Withdrawal of Finality

1. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Withdrawn Rejections

2. The 103(a) rejection of claims 1 - 26 over Wright et al. (USPN 6,416,857) in view of Mocilnikar et al. (USPN 5,346,259) in the office action dated June 15, 2006 is withdrawn as Applicant's amendments and arguments in the response dated February 9, 2007 are found to be persuasive.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
4. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10 – 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 24 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright et al. (USPN 6,416,857) in view of Shadle et al. (USPN 6,270,122).

Wright et al. disclose a tamper indicating device (Column 1, lines 9 – 10) used in

combination with an object having secured information (Column 9, lines 7 – 18) comprising a backing having a first side and a second side (Column 3, lines 15 – 16), wherein the backing comprises a first phase and a second phase (Column 3, lines 17 – 19), wherein the backing has a first level of light diffusion, and when a peeling force is applied to the backing, the backing fractures (Column 3, lines 32 – 38) and has a second level of light diffusion that is a higher level of light diffusion than the first level of light diffusion (Column 2, lines 27 – 31) a flood coat applied to the second side of the backing (Column 4, lines 53 – 56), an adhesive layer bonded to the flood coat (Column 5, lines 56 – 58) in claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 10, 14 16, 18, 21, 22 and 25.

Regarding claims 2, 5, 9, 13, 14, 17, 20, 23 and 24, the tamper indicating device further comprises at least one security marking applied to the first side of the backing (Column 4, lines 56 – 59). As in claims 4, 11, 15, 19 and 26, the adhesive layer is a pressure sensitive adhesive layer covered with a release liner (Column 5, lines 56 – 58). Wright et al. also disclose a tamper indicating device used in combination with an object having secured information (Column 9, lines 7 – 18) comprising a backing having a first side and a second side (Column 3, lines 15 – 16), wherein the backing comprises a first phase and a second phase (Column 3, lines 17 – 19), wherein the backing is light transmissive, and when a peeling force is applied to the backing, the backing fractures (Column 3, lines 32 – 38) and become more opaque (Column 2, lines 27 – 31); an adhesive layer applied to the second side of the backing (Column 5, lines 56 – 58), wherein the adhesive is colored and bonded to the application surface of the object (Column 9, lines 37 – 42). However, Wright et al. fail to disclose the flood coat defining a window therein, a mask applied to the tamper indicating device and the mask being in partial or whole registration with the window in the flood coat.

Shadle et al. teach an irreversible display (Figure 12, #110) having a flood coat defining a window therein (Figure 13, #118), a mask applied to the tamper indicating device (Figure 13, #120) and the mask being in partial or whole registration with the window in the flood coat (Figure 13, #118 and 120) for the purpose of having a display that temporarily obscuring predetermined indicia from view (Column 1, lines 44 – 45)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to have provided the flood coat layer with a window covered by a masking layer in Wright et al. in order to have having a display that temporarily obscuring predetermined indicia from view as taught by Shadle et al.

5. Claims 2, 5, 8, 9, 14, 17, 20, 23 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright et al. (USPN 6,416,857) in view of Shadle et al. (USPN 6,270,122) as applied to claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10 – 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 24 and 26 above, and further in view of Mocilnikar et al. (USPN 5,346,259).

Wright et al., as modified with Shadle et al., disclose a tamper indicating device used in combination with an object having secured information comprising a backing having a first side and a second side, wherein the backing comprises a first phase and a second phase, wherein the backing has a first level of light diffusion, and when a peeling force is applied to the backing, the backing fractures and has a second level of light diffusion that is a higher level of light diffusion than the first level of light diffusion a flood coat applied to the second side of the backing, an

adhesive layer bonded to the flood coat, having a flood coat defining a window therein, a mask applied to the tamper indicating device and the mask being in partial or whole registration with the window in the flood coat. However, the modified Wright et al. fail to disclose the security marking has the same color as the flood coat.

Mocilnikar et al. teach an anti-theft label wherein the security marking has the same color as the flood coat (Column 4, lines 34 – 43) for the purpose of having a label wherein the label and information become unusable due to the damaged label (Column 3, lines 19 – 29).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to have provided the security marking has the same color as the flood coat in the modified Wright et al. in order to have a label wherein the label and information become unusable due to the damaged label as taught by Mocilnikar et al.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 – 26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Please see the newly presented rejections above with regard to the flood coat defining a window therein, a mask applied to the tamper indicating device and the mask being in partial or whole registration with the window in the flood coat

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patricia L. Nordmeyer whose telephone number is (571) 272-1496. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thurs. from 10:00-7:30 & alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Y. Pyon can be reached on (571) 272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Patricia L. Nordmeyer
Patricia L. Nordmeyer
Examiner
Art Unit 1772

pln